



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,137	10/30/2003	Jeffrey A. West	TI-36238	9756
23494	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			GUERRERO, MARIA F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2822	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JK

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/697,137	WEST ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Maria Guerrero	2822	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-11-05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment and the Request for continued examination filed November 11, 2005.

#### **Status of Claims**

2. Claim 8 is canceled. Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are pending.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 11, 2005 has been entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zistl et al. (U.S. 6,806,191).

Zistl et al. teaches forming a dielectric layer, forming openings in the dielectric layer, filling the openings with a barrier, a copper seed and an electroplated copper film (Fig. 1a, col. 4, lines 35-67, col. 5, lines 1-5). Zistl et al. shows chemically-mechanically polishing the copper film and gaseously doping the copper film with silicon (copper/silicon film 107) (not copper silicide) (Fig. 1b, 3a, Abstract, col. 5, lines 1-40, col. 6, lines 7-31). Zistl et al. discloses the dielectric layer comprising an interlevel dielectric having vias and an intrametal dielectric having trenches (col. 4, lines 35-55). Zistl et al. teaches doping only a top region of the copper film with silicon by flowing silane at a temperature of about 350°C to about 420 °C for about 3 to about 10 seconds (col. 5, lines 60-63, col. 6, lines 8-32). Zistl et al. shows the doping as part of a silicon nitride deposition process (Abstract, col. 7, lines 20-40).

5. Zistl et al. teaches transferring the semiconductor body to a chamber, performing the doping by flowing silane for a given time prior striking a plasma in the chamber (Abstract, col. 6, lines 7-10). Zistl et al. shows striking the plasma after flowing the silane for about 3 seconds (at least 0.5 seconds is included) and flowing at least one nitrogen-containing source gas into the chamber to deposit a silicon nitride layer over the copper interconnect (Abstract, col. 6, lines 8-65, col. 7, lines 13-40).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zistl et al. (U.S. 6,806,191).

Zistl et al. teaches forming a dielectric layer, forming openings in the dielectric layer, filling the openings with a barrier, a copper seed and an electroplated copper film (Fig. 1a, col. 4, lines 35-67, col. 5, lines 1-5). Zistl et al. shows chemically-mechanically polishing the copper film and gaseously doping the copper film with silicon (copper/silicon film 107) (not copper silicide) (Fig. 1b, 3a, Abstract, col. 5, lines 1-40, col. 6, lines 7-31). Zistl et al. discloses the dielectric layer comprising an interlevel dielectric having

Art Unit: 2822

vias and an intrametal dielectric having trenches (col. 4, lines 35-55). Zistl et al. teaches doping only a top region of the copper film with silicon by flowing silane at a temperature of about 350°C to about 420 °C for about 3 to about 10 seconds (col. 5, lines 60-63, col. 6, lines 8-32). Zistl et al. shows the doping as part of a silicon nitride deposition process (Abstract, col. 7, lines 20-40).

Zistl et al. does not specifically show the final bulk silicon concentration in the range as claimed. However, "where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to specify the range as claimed by routine experimentation because there is not evidence of criticality. In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir.1990). See MPEP § 716.02 - § 716.02(g).

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's arguments filed November 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claim 1-2, 4-7 and 9-12 stand rejected.

9. Applicant argued that Zitsl et al. does not disclose or suggest flowing a gas chemistry consisting essentially of silane over the copper film. However, the transitional

Art Unit: 2822

phrase "consisting essentially of" limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps "and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s)" of the claimed invention. *In re Herz*, 537 F.2d 549, 551-52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976) (emphasis in original). "A consisting essentially of' claim occupies a middle ground between closed claims that are written in a consisting of' format and fully open claims that are drafted in a comprising' format." *PPG Industries v. Guardian Industries*, 156 F.3d 1351, 1354, 48 USPQ2d 1351, 1353-54 (Fed. Cir. 1998). See also *Atlas Powder v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 224 USPQ 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Janakirama-Rao*, 317 F.2d 951, 137 USPQ 893 (CCPA 1963); *Water Technologies Corp. vs. Calco, Ltd.*, 850 F.2d 660, 7USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., *PPG*, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355.

If an applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of," applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's invention. *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also *Ex parte Hoffman*, 12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd.Pat. App. & Inter. 1989). *AK Steel Corp. v. Sollac*, 344 F.3d 1234, 1240-41, 68 USPQ2d 1280, 1283-84 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

10. In addition, during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given  
\*>their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re  
Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). While the claims  
of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior  
art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during  
examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their  
terms reasonably allow. > In re American Academy of Science Tech Center, F.3d, 2004  
WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004)(The USPTO uses a different standard for  
construing claims than that used by district courts; during examination the USPTO must  
give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation.) < This means that the words of the  
claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition  
in the specification. In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir.  
1989) >; Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc., 358 F.3d 1371, 1372, 69 USPQ2d  
1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term is the  
meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at  
the time of the invention, *i.e.*, as of the effective filing date of the patent application."  
*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, \_\_F.3d\_\_, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*en banc*).

11. Furthermore, "The use of patents as references is not limited to what the  
patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are  
concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain." In re  
Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re  
Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)). A reference may



Art Unit: 2822

be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). See also *Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir.1998). Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ423 (CCPA 1971).

12. In addition, Applicant does not provide evidence of unexpected results. To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. *In re Hill*, 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960). Applicants must further show that the results were greater than those which would have been expected from the prior art to an unobvious extent, and that the results are of a significant, practical advantage. *Ex parte The NutraSweet Co.*, 19 USPQ2d 1586 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1991). See MPEP § 716.02 - § 716.02(g).

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. *Armbrust et al.* (US 6,251,775) and *Liu et al.* (US 6,046,108) teach several embodiments related to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2822

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Guerrero whose telephone number is 571-272-1837.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 571-272-1852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 22, 2005

*Maria Guerrero*  
**MARIA F. GUERRERO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**